



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/689,092	10/12/2000	Motoki Kobayashi	SONY-U0297	8331
29175 7590 05/04/2004		EXAMINER		
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC P. O. BOX 1135			PILLAI, NAMITHA	
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	12
			DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

_	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/689,092	KOBAYASHI ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Namitha Pillai	2173			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 12 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appetexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:	•				
$3.\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	etion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		//			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	:			
10. Other:					
		JOHN CABECA			
	SUPER\	ISORY PATENT EXAMINEP INOLOGY DENTER 2100			
		The state of the s			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Rowe has clearly disclosed the role of icons being represented in hierarchical views wherein the Figures with three columns are merely examples and wherein Rowe has realized this as an example and explains in the specification that the types of information displayed may vary along with the number of columns displayed may vary as was discussed in the Final Rejection. Hence, even though a fourth column much like the other three columns may not be displayed in the Figures of Rowe, the teaching of providing various coulumns including a fourth set of icons in a column is disclosed in Rowe and hence the claims are presented would not overcome the prior art combination of Rowe and the Excel art.